(C)

G. R. S. IX-5]

1863-64

Previous references.

File No. 3 of 63

191 .

(S. R)

Serial Nos. 1—

Later references.

D

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 3

Major **Part B for** July 1864

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Arrack Sellers of Cantonment against Mr. Mergler

---

Indexed

SB

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

...ish leaves the ...
... I may observe that ...
... additional number of ...
... is permitted it will ...
... essential to collect the Duty ...
... before the Spirit is taken away. ...
... The most recent accounts show ...
... that 2/6 per Gallon is not too ...
... high a Duty to levy, and I would ...
... support this for Ireland; but ...
... before doing so, the Supt should ...
... place himself in communication ...
... with the Supt of Distillation. ...
... It will probably be found advisable ...
... to issue Wholesale vend Licenses ...
... as laid down in the rules ...

... If the Distilling within the ...
... Fort enclosure is made open to ...
... sale as was at first contemplated, the ...
... Govt has only two points to look ...
... to. 1. The rate of State Head Duty ...
... 2. The amount of license fee for ...
... retail vend. In order to secure ...
... the proper amount of fee ...
... and as a consequence, the ...
... selling rate of Spirit, I think, ...
... as before observed that it ...
... would be judicious to put the ...
... retail vend licenses up to ...
... auction.

B 18/5/64

No. 25

Central

1864.165

From The Superintendent
Penang

To The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner

Section

File No.
Dated 14 May 1864
Despatched 16
No.
Received 18th " a o

Enclosures No. 2

G. No. 153
24
Subject

Ref. 28/1

Submits, with remarks, a Report from the Superintendent of Police on a Petition from the Arrack Renters

Orders

Cant. 17/5/64

I agree that there need be no check upon the distilling, further than the absolute rule that all Spirit must be distilled within the Fort enclosure, and that the State Head Duty be paid

Genl: No: 153
General 24

Bangalore Division
Superintendent's Office

To.

The Secretary to the Commissioner
for the Government of the Territories
of the Rajah of Mysore.

Devéroys droog 14th May 1864

Sir

I have the honor to submit a letter No: 14 of the 12th Instant from the Superintendent of Police, reporting on the petition of certain Arrack Retail sellers, which accompanied your Offl: Memo: No: 7 of the 3d idem on which I would remark that Mr. Murphy has not obtained the monopoly of the manufacture and sale of Spirits in Bangalore or elsewhere he has at present virtually the monopoly in his own hands, as he plied in September last for permission to erect Stills. Exclusive of which the only application received by me for erecting a Still in the Government enclosure was only received on the 1st Instant and was submitted the same days for the Commissioners

2. ..... and that up to this day not a single Bangalore Retail vendor has either verbally, or by petition made any representation to me connected with the new system

3. I am however now prepared after considering the several complaints preferred to the Commissioner since the 1st Instant, to request

20th April 1864 No 4 304

To Mr Rosher

Namasawmy Pillay

&

Others

To

L. B. Bowring Esquire
Chief Commissioner in Mysore

The humble Representation of all the Bangalore Cantonment Arrack shop Keepers dated 28th April 1864

Most Respectfully Showeth,

That with the utmost humility we beg leave to acquain your Honor that at the beginning when the Government permitt and established the abkary Department to Lutchmana Moodly &c. &c. engaged in this work and performed it to the Satisfaction of bo the Contractors and to the Government for 20 years and when it pleas the Government to take the management itself, we continued and served for 15 years according to the Restructions laid down for our guidance leaving a deposit in the Sirkar from 50 to 300 Rs for each shop ——— But after Mr. Mergler and Kullappachetty were entrusted with the abkary Contract they increased the said Deposits from 300 to 600 Rs and as 25 out of us old Shop keepe could not pay such heavy Deposits, they lost their livelihood and their Shops were let out to others -

In fact Sir, many other oppressions introduced by the said Contractors, these exorbitant Deposits has ruine many of us, and the said contractors now hold Deposits from us for 65 Cantonment shops in the Sume of Rs 45,000 — and 40,000 Rupees for shops in the Pettah and Vulagudee

It is necessary to acquaint you that we have acte according to the Sirkar Regulations for 35 years ———

We were informed by the Bangalore Talook Cutchery that we would be relieved from the distress of the presen

of the present Contractors from 1st May and that the Sirkar is going to take the management themselves and we were asked whether we will abide by the new Rules to be introduced by your Honor, to which we all joyfully and willingly consented and signed our names - that is to receive Licence from the Sirkar and sell liquors, but from that date we have not been favored with any other information on this subject

We therefore pray we may be allowed to remain when the Sirkar takes the management and thus protect us

We beg to Remain
most honored &
your most obedient and humble Servants

We therefore most respectfully crave at your hands, to be relieved of further interference of Mr. Morgler with us - And that we are ever ready to pray to Government direct the duty & Liscence &c as he Mr. Morgler has not to date to date remitted to us the deposit he received for our Shops viz Rs 85,000 —/—

Bangalore
27th April
1864

T. No 184. Bangalore 12th May 1864

To

The Superintendent

of the Nundydroog Division

Bangalore

Dated 12th May 1864

Sir,

In reply to your Official Memo, No. 69/4 of 9th Instant, forwarding a Petition from the Arrack Sellers of this Cantonment to the address of the Commissioner, I have the honor to state that there is no doubt that there is a strong party against Mr. Mergler, but the chief complaint is that he has fixed too high a price in his liquor & that they can procure it elsewhere, or distil it themselves, at a lower price, and they request permission either to purchase their liquor, where they like, or to erect Stills, within the Sudder enclosure and distil for themselves. As far as I remember the rules laid down for the Revenue Officers in the North West Provinces, the Sudder Distillery system does not give the distillation as a monopoly to one Contractor, but each Vendor may erect his own still and dis-

his own liquor within the enclosure and no where else. For Districts, where Vendors reside at great distances and cannot well distil for themselves in the Sudder enclosure, a Contractor is necessary but the limited space of this Cantonment and great scope for competition a Contractor is not so much required.

2 The enclosures of your letter are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedt. Servant

Cant. Magistrate

Genl

1864

To Sir [illegible] Smidibroog Dirr

Section
File No
Serial No

Date Rec'd
Despatched } 19th May
Received

Enclosures, No

General No. 286 } 1864/65
General No. 21

Sir

I have the honour to transmit herewith for your information a Copy of a Letter from the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Department, dated the 3rd instant, on the subject of the Establishment of a Museum at Calcutta.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient
humble Servant

Subject.

In reply to No. 753/24 dated the 4th, conveying Government observations on the management and sale of opium

To Bangalore, 19th May 1864.

The Superintendent
of Ashtagram
Nundidroog

Sir

In reply to your letter
No. 153/24 of the 14th Instant, the
Contractor desires me to state,
that he agrees that there
must be separate checks upon
distilling consists in the Government
of the absolute rule that all
Spirit must be distilled
within the Govt. Enclosure
and that the Still head
duly be sealed before the
Vendor leaves the premises.
He observes that if an addi-
tional number of distillers
is permitted, it will be
desirable essential to collect the
Duty before the Spirit is
taken away. The most-
recent accounts shows that
Rs 2/8 per gallon is not-
too high a duty to levy,
and he would suggest that for
a reduction, but before doing
so, you are requested to place
yourself in communication
with the Supt of Ashtagram.

B 18/5/64

and not merely to divide the sums due weekly

It will probably be found advisable to issue wholesale & retail licenses as laid down in the rules.

2. If distilling within the Govt. Enclosure is made open to all as was at first contemplated, the Govt. has only two points to look to. 1st. The rate of Still head duty and 2d. The amount of license fee for retailing. In order to ascertain the proper amount of fee, and also as a consequence, the selling rate of Spirits, the Comm. considers it proper observed that it would be judicious to limit the retail vend licenses not to auction.

Adam

Revenue No. 32

1804/1865

From Subcollector
Guicavaroo Dr.

To Secretary to the
Commissioner

Dated 30 July 1864

Despatched do.

Received 30 do.

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Enclosures, No.

General No. 1167

Revenue No. 2

Subject

Repts having raised the duty on arrack from 2 Rupees to 3 Rupees in the Collectorate of Tuticorin

Answer with respect

3 Rupees

The Supt should inform the Supt of all stages of the enhanced rate.

B 1/8/64

Mysore Survey
Superintendents Office

General 1167
Revenue 32 Jy

Bangalore, 30 July 1864.

The Secretary to the
Commissioner for the Government of the
Territories of H.H. the Rajah of Mysore,

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to your
Letter No 286/P 21 of the 19 May last, to report for
the information of the Commissioner that I
have raised the Assy on all arrack sold in
the Cantonment and Town of Bangalore
from Rupees two to Rupees Two and
Annas four; to have effect from the first
Proxime

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obt Servant

R Bowles
Superintendent